



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,418	01/05/2005	Karin Schuetze	62514(45107)	9914
21874 7590 04/10/2008 EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205				
EXAMINER SELLMAN, CACHET I				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1792				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/10/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/520,418

Applicant(s)

SCHUETZE ET AL.

Examiner

CACHET I. SELLMAN

Art Unit

1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-45 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 44 and 45 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-43 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This supplemental office action is being sent in response to the applicant's call to the Examiner stating the reference cited US 6523248 in section 7 of the previous office action mailed 1/24/2008 is the wrong patent number for Lossing et al.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 33 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Dependent claim 33, claims that the film is a UV laser light absorbing film, however, claim 23 from which it depends contains the limitation that the film is a uv laser light absorbing film.

The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

2. Misnumbered claim 33 been renumbered 32. Claim 32 is missing in the claim listing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1792

2. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claim 30 recites the limitation "the preparation, mixture or pure substance" in line

2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Note: It seems that claim 30 should depend from claim 29 instead of 23.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 23-31,34-37 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lossing et al. (US 6528248) in view of Bova (US 2002/0025511) and Baer (US 2001/0028934).

Lossing et al. teaches a process for processing a biological sample for laser capture microdissection which includes the steps of providing a biological sample, applying a substance to the sample that provides a barrier between the sample and the surrounding environment. Lossing et al. teaches that the process reduces non-specific pickup, improves visualization, decreases degradation and contamination of the sample (see abstract) (**claim 31**).

Lossing et al. does not teach that the film used is a UV absorbing film as required by **claim 23**. However, it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made the problem associated with ultraviolet light breaking single, or double strand DNA in biological systems and the use of a transparent UV slip used when using laser devices as taught by Bova.

Futhermore, Baer et al. discloses a process for laser capture microdissection for biological samples where a coating is applied such as an EVA and that additives can be included into the EVA such as UV absorbers (see paragraph 0043).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Lossing et al. to include the use of UV absorbers in the film as taught by Bova and Baer et al. in order to protect the sample from the UV light which can adversely affect the DNA strands in the sample.

Lossing et al. teaches that the film can be applied by dissolving the coating material into a solvent and dipping the slide having the tissue into the coating solution, spraying or aerosolizing the coating solution (see col. 4, lines 1-27) (**claims 24-26**). Lossing teaches that the clear coat is ELVAX which is an ethylene vinyl acetate (see col. 4, line 38-48). ELVAX is a non toxic material and is inert and does not have any adverse effects on the biological material (**claims 27-28**). The material used is a transparent preparation, mixture and/or pure substance such as waxes or low molecular weight oligomers, polyethylene, alcohols, acrylates, urethanes, epoxies, (see coal. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 11) (**claims 29-30**). The RNA and DNA of the sample is preserved by using a UV absorbing film as required by **claims 35-36**. The coating of Lossing et al. affects the fluorescence of the tissue sample by increasing its fluorescence (see col. 8, lines 47-67) **claim 37**. The ELVAX material is dissolved in a solvent (**claim 41**) where the solvent is xylene (see col. 4, lines 37-45) (**claim 42**). After the film is solidified it facilitates cutting or catapulting the film and the biological material underneath with a laser beam (see col. 8, lines 35-42) (**claim 43**).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cachet I. Sellman whose telephone number is 571-272-

Art Unit: 1792

0691. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00 - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cachet I Sellman
Examiner
Art Unit 1792

/C. I. S./

Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/William Phillip Fletcher III/

for Timothy H. Meeks, SPE of Art Unit 1792/1700